

Audit Trail

Comments on Draft Approach Paper for the Evaluation of the Country Support Program

#	Agency	Comment	Response and Action Taken
1	IEO	[Theory of Change] Good to share and validate the ToC proposed with the CSP team.	Agreed. Report shared with CSP team.
2	IEO	[Evaluation questions] Suggestions: Due to previous evaluations done on CSP, it would be good to look at shortcomings identified from previous studies; Look into GEFSEC Country Officers and communication protocols.	Integrated into evaluation matrix.
3	IEO	[Evaluation questions] Efficiency section: needs rewording as it can be perceived objective with positive spin	Fixed
4	IEO	[Evaluation questions] Effectiveness section: they have different objectives per activity.	Noted. Will be dealt with during analysis.
5	IEO	[Evaluation questions] Coherence section: Identify how CSP activities look to deliver against convention requirements. With the programming directions on integrated approaches, it would be useful to look at whether CSP is meeting convention requirements and moving countries into integrated approaches.	Integrated in interview protocols and evolution of CSP activity focus.
6	IEO	[Evaluation questions] Lessons learned: What are the lessons? Benchmark against other partnerships. In the IEO, we found this useful in other evaluations we worked on (such as GEF Evaluation Policy)	Answered in questions 4 and 4.2
7	IEO	[Interview / E-survey] Ensure civil society members will be interviewed. Keep in mind that countries prefer working with certain agencies and groups more so than others. Interview questions should be targeted to different stakeholder groups (CSOs, Agencies, Focal Points, etc). Baastel/IEO to provide names to GEFSEC of who will be interviewed.	Answered through document
8	GEFSEC	[Page 1] This has been going or evolving for at least 8-12 years. Needs to be more specific. Redraft could be: In the current replenishment period, the GEF partnership agreed to further deepen its move towards more integrated	Text has been addressed
9	GEFSEC	[Page 1] I don't understand what "broad responsibilities of the MEAs" means.	Fixed
10	GEFSEC	[Page 1] This should read GEF-7. GEF-8 will have a new probably different strategy so we cannot talk about programming for GEF-8 yet.	Fixed
11	GEFSEC	[Page 1] The correct word according to the Instrument is Participants.	Fixed
12	GEFSEC	[Page 2] Replenishment cycle. If we include the Pilot phase it would have been 8 investment cycles.	Noted and fixed.
13	GEFSEC	[Page 2] Should mention the Instrument which is the document that gives the GEF life. It combines with the mandates arising from the MEAs.	Noted and fixed.

14	GEFSEC	[Page 2] Not every country has two. May be better to delete these words.	Fixed
15	GEFSEC	[Page 9] Has not disappeared. The work on programming is done through the National Dialogues.	Fixed
16	GEFSEC	[Page 9] This is active as the knowledge management activities of the Secretariat. In fact it has been upgraded to its own stream with e-courses. It is also visible in the ECWs in the Knowledge days.	Noted as a footnote
17	GEFSEC	[Page 10] Please note that 2014 had no ECWs and no Introduction Seminar	Noted
18	GEFSEC	[Page 10] Please note that 2018 had no ECWs, and no Introduction Seminar	Noted
19	GEFSEC	[Page 14] The GEF does not produce annual reports.	Noted – added 2011 and 2012 in parenthesis
20	GEFSEC	[Page 15] These are Council Members and Alternates and the majority are also GEF Operational or Political focal points. Currently only the Council Member from India is not a GEF Focal Point. May need to change wording or define what is a “Constituency Focal Point”	Noted
21	GEFSEC	[Page 18] The team has provided all the information available. Was anything missing? On what basis can the team make its own database?	Detailed list of documents required have been provided by email to CSP team
22	GEFSEC	[Page 22] Are we sure of these numbers?	Noted and double-checked